

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

**PIN:** 5636  
**APPLICANT NAME:** Pajaro Valley Water Management Agency  
**PROJECT TITLE:** Pajaro River Watershed IRWMP Implementation

**FUNDS REQUESTED:** \$27,954,600  
**COST MATCH:** \$55,406,000  
**TOTAL PROJECT COST:** \$83,360,600

**DESCRIPTION:** The eight implementation projects provide water supply, flood protection, and water quality and environmental enhancement. This IRWMP was developed through the efforts of a three-agency collaborative of the Pajaro Valley Water Management Agency (PVWMA), San Benito County Water District, and Santa Clara Valley Water District, and many watershed stakeholders. The collaborative designated PVWMA as the lead agency for the IRWMP implementation projects. Partners with PVWMA for implementation projects are: the City of Watsonville, Aromas Water District, the County of Santa Cruz Flood Control and Water Conservation District Zone 7, Monterey County Water Resources Agency, Action Pajaro Valley, The Nature Conservancy, and the Santa Cruz County Resources Conservation District.

**Question: Consistency with Minimum IRWM Standards - This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated that the IRWM Plan meets the minimum standards.**

Pass

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption. Weighting factor is 1.** 2

The application includes a draft IRWMP and a schedule for its adoption in October 2006.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Description of Region. Weighting factor is 1.** 5

The IRWMP includes maps showing the region, which is well described. Water resources of the region are described including quantity and quality. Existing and projected water demand is described for the period from 2005 to 2025, a 20 year planning horizon. Ecological processes/environmental resources, social, cultural and economic conditions are discussed in the IRWMP.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Objectives. Weighting factor is 1.** 5

Four major goals are developed in the areas of water supply, water quality, flood protection, and environmental enhancement. Under each goal are several specific objectives with some objectives meeting multiple goals. Potential conflicts between some of the objectives were identified and will be addressed in later planning and implementation activities. Potential conflicts with other regional non-IRWMP objectives (e.g., land use planning) are also identified. It is anticipated that the IRWMP stakeholder process will provide a forum for conflict resolution.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Water Management Strategies and Integration. Weighting factor is 1.** 5

A full range of water management strategies and potential projects are identified and evaluated according to the IRWMP goals and objectives. Appropriate strategies/projects were linked to the specific objectives and integrated with the other strategies/projects under each objective. Projects and strategies deemed suitable for rapid implementation are grouped into three water management programs: water supply, flood protection, and water quality. Better integration and coordination with proposal #3398 Santa Cruz County on Watsonville projects may be appropriate.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Priorities and Schedule. Weighting factor is 1.** 4

The IRWMP identifies short- and long-term projects and priorities using a three step prioritization process to rank project elements. A consensus based approach with the Stakeholder Steering committee is used to develop criteria for ranking. This process determined the schedule to implement individual projects. Decision on long-term projects remain open and thus allow responsiveness to regional changes. The IRWMP does not fully and clearly discuss the adaptive management process.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Implementation. Weighting factor is 1.** 4

Several specific immediate-term projects are described, responsible entities identified, and the integration of the programs are discussed in the IRWMP. The final IRWMP, to be adopted in 2006, will identify and prioritize near- and long-term projects. Economic and technical feasibility are discussed on a programmatic level. Long-term projects are not fully described at this time.

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Impacts and Regional Benefits. Weighting factor is 1.

4

The application does a good job of addressing impacts and regional benefits of the IRWMP related to proposed projects, and link them to the mission, goals, and objectives of the IRWMP. CEQA and NEPA compliance has been completed or in process for projects that are ready for implementation. Impacts and benefits of longer-term projects and programs are not well evaluated. Benefits to DACs of near and long-term implementation projects will be explored in the next phase of the IRWMP.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Technical Analysis and Plan Performance. Weighting factor is 1.

4

Large amounts of data and technical analyses were produced to support the water management strategies (i.e., implementation projects). These strategies/projects also have adequate measures planned to evaluate project performance. Some of the water management strategies are to conduct additional studies to address identified data gaps and to get the data needed to develop or refine additional implementation projects. The mechanisms to be used to adapt ongoing projects based on the data to be collected are not described in detail.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Data Management. Weighting factor is 1.

5

Data will be provided to the stakeholders and the public in three main ways: 1) the Action Pajaro Valley stakeholder process, 2) regular public meetings of the participating agencies, and 3) through the CEQA/NEPA process for implementation projects. The IRWMP team will also maintain a public website to disseminate data and other IRWMP information. Data will be managed in a format compatible with SWAMP and GAMA and also will be provided to those databases at least annually. Existing monitoring efforts are described in the regional description section of the draft IRWMP.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Financing. Weighting factor is 1.

4

Financing plans include a variety of mechanisms, such as sale of municipal bonds, grant funding from State and federal agencies, low interest loans, land assessments, water rates, and other sources. Beneficiaries are identified for the various proposed projects. Parties responsible for project implementation and project O&M costs are identified. Discussions regarding ongoing support and financing for O&M of implemented projects could be more fully explained.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Relation to Local Planning & Sustainability. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The IRWMP seeks to support of regional water resources management planning, but provides no significant link to water and land use elements of general plans for the region. The IRWMP mentions that volumes of watershed reports were reviewed; most of these are reports and not plans. The application demonstrates a relationship with stakeholders and claims that the IRWMP will be coordinated with various UWMP's and GWMPs. The applicant provided only weak coordination with land use planning in the region which was insufficient to demonstrate the required coordination.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination. Weighting factor is 1. 5

Stakeholder involvement in IRWMP development is well documented. Processes and mechanisms for stakeholder participation in the IRWMP are described (e.g., the Stakeholder Steering Committee). Stakeholder outreach is planned to continue through finalization and implementation of the IRWMP. Major involvement of a DAC (Watsonville) in the IRWMP process is documented. Specific environmental justice concerns, such as employment and water rates, were brought into the IRWMP development process. Potential obstacles to the IRWMP were identified and will be resolved using a consensus approach. The jurisdictions and interests of the relevant State and federal agencies in implementing the IRWMP are identified, as are the needed regulatory actions.

Question: Funding Match. This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated the ability to meet the minimum funding match or has requested a waiver or reduction in the funding match.

Pass

### Question: Description of Proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

12

The proposal consists of 8 well described projects, which address most of the water management elements. The goals and objectives of the 3 component programs were identified and the 8 are consistent with those goals and objectives. Each project has its own plan to meet environmental requirements. The main water quality project (#8) provides information on water bodies, water quality problems, plans and policies, and NPS management measures. Each project has identified the metrics to be used to measure the project's success at meeting its objectives. However, there is little focus in the proposal on how it will result in source water protection. Several of the items lack detail; for example, under the heading of Scientific Basis, a list of studies and feasibility evaluations would have been useful.

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

### Question: Project Prioritization. Weighting factor is 2.

10

Eight projects that are ready for implementation were prioritized using a three step process. Economic benefits, regional needs, multi-agency benefits, and DAC benefits were considered and rated.

### Question: Cost Estimate. Weighting factor is 1.

5

Cost estimates for eight projects are presented and a summary cost estimate. In general the budgets are reasonable and agree with the tasks shown. Requested Grant Funding is shown for individual budget categories. Other State funds are shown for Project 2.

### Question: Schedule. Weighting factor is 1.

5

Overall project schedules and component task schedules are provided for each of the eight proposed projects. Multi-phase projects have budgets and schedules detailed in the proposal for the phase that is proposed for grant funding. Phases not proposed for funding at this time are explained and scheduled in the IRWMP.

### Question: Need. Weighting factor is 2.

10

Need for the eight proposed projects include solving problems associated with seawater intrusion, flooding, fish impacts, water quality, and supply sustainability issues. Regional water management systems and long-term needs are discussed in detail. Each of the proposed projects is described as to show how it meets regional needs and how the needs relate to economic and environmental impacts. Impacts (including economic, environmental, and fiscal) from not completing each of the projects are also discussed.

### Question: Disadvantaged Communities. Weighting factor is 2.

10

No match waiver is being requested for the implementation program. DACs are documented to exist within the proposed project areas and will benefit from the projects. A significant portion of the benefits of the proposed projects will occur within the DACs.

### Question: Program Preferences. Weighting factor is 1.

4

The proposed projects meet, at least minimally, all Program Preferences. The ability of the projects to achieve water quality standards and to reduce pollution in impaired waters and sensitive habitats may not be large, but it may result in some measurable improvements in some standards and impairments.

<b>TOTAL SCORE: 106</b>
-------------------------